

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3 to 5, 8 to 10, 12 to 14 and 16 to 27 are pending in this application of which claims 1, 10, 14, 18 and 23 are the independent claims. Favorable reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Applicants held teleconferences on March 1 and June 27, 2006 to clarify the Examiner's Office Action. No agreement was reached with respect to the claims.

Claims 1 to 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by or under § 103(a) obvious over Miwa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,806,881).

Amended claim 1 is directed to a method which includes assigning a first memory to a first memory channel and assigning a second memory to a second memory channel. The first memory is equal in memory size to the second memory. The method also includes assigning a third memory to a third memory channel. The third memory includes a first memory portion equal in memory size to the first memory and includes a second memory portion. The method further includes interleaving the first memory, the second memory and the first memory portion of the third memory in a three-way interleaving, determining a selected memory channel from the first memory channel, the second memory channel and the third memory channel for a program address and mapping the program address to a physical address within the selected memory channel.

The applied art is not understood to disclose or to suggest the foregoing features of claim 1. In particular, Miwa does not disclose or suggest interleaving the first memory, the second memory and the first memory portion of the third memory in a three-way interleaving.

Specifically, Miwa describes interleaving using memory channels that sum to a number equal to a power of 2 (e.g., 1, 2, 4, 8, 16, 32, 64 and so forth) (see column 2, lines 1 to 5, FIGS. 4A-4X and FIG. 10 of Miwa, for example). Furthermore, Miwa does not mention interleaving a portion of a memory assigned to a memory channel. Therefore, Applicants submit that Miwa does not disclose or suggest interleaving the first memory, the second memory and the first memory portion of the third memory in a three-way interleaving. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the art rejection.

Claim 10 is a system claim having corresponding features to claim 1. Claim 14 is an article claim having corresponding features to claim 1. Applicants submit the Miwa reference should also be withdrawn with respect to claims 10 and 14 for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 18 is directed to a method, which includes designating a range of addresses defined as the memory between an upper address to perform range checking and a lower address to perform range checking, monitoring memory accesses and determining if any of the memory accesses occur within the range of addresses and in response to a memory access occurring with the range of memory addresses then performing a predetermined operation.

The applied art is not understood to disclose or to suggest the foregoing features of claim 18. In particular, Miwa does not disclose or suggest determining if any of the memory accesses occur within said range of addresses and in response to a memory access occurring with the range of memory addresses then performing a predetermined operation.

As understood by Applicants Miwa does not disclose determining if any of the memory accesses occurs within the range of memory addresses much less performing a predetermined operation in response to the memory access occurring in the range of memory addresses.

Applicants note that the office action does not specifically address the elements of claim 18. If the Examiner disagrees, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner indicate where in the Miwa reference the elements of claim 18 may be found. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the art rejection.

Claim 23 is an article claim having corresponding features to claim 18. Applicants submit that the Miwa reference should also be withdrawn with respect to claim 23 for at least the same reasons as claim 18.

Applicant submits that all dependent claims now depend on allowable independent claims.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for withdrawing the prior art cited with regards to any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Applicants : Kuo et al.
Serial No. : 10751,263
Filed : December 30, 2003
Page : 14 of 14

Attorney's Docket No.: Intel-010PUS
Intel Docket No.: P17937

Applicants submit that the entire application is now in condition for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

All correspondence should be directed to the address below. Applicants' attorney can be reached by telephone at (781) 401-9988 ext. 23.

Enclosed is a Petition for a Two-Month Extension of Time. No other fee is believed to be due for this Response; however, if any other fees are due, please apply such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0845 referencing Attorney Docket: Intel-010PUS.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 07/14/06

/Anthony T. Moosey/
Anthony T. Moosey
Reg. No. 55,773

Attorneys for Intel Corporation
Daly, Crowley, Mofford & Durkee, LLP
354A Turnpike Street - Suite 301A
Canton, MA 02021-2714
Telephone: (781) 401-9988 ext. 23
Facsimile: (781) 401-9966